

CA24N  
XC 20  
87L25



---

# Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly

Report on the Service of Process on  
the Member for Brantford  
within the Precincts of the House

3rd Session 33rd Parliament  
36 Elizabeth II







CARDON  
XC 20  
-87/25

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
ASSEMBLÉE LÉGISLATIVE

TORONTO, ONTARIO  
M7A 1A2

The Honourable Hugh Edighoffer, M.P.P.,  
Speaker of the Legislative Assembly.

Sir,

Your Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly has the honour  
to present its Report and commends it to the House.

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Michael J. Breough".

Michael J. Breough, M.P.P.  
Chairman

Queen's Park  
29 April 1987



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2022 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761114686223>



MEMBERSHIP OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

MICHAEL J. BREAUGH  
Chairman of the Committee

REMO MANCINI  
Vice-Chairman of the Committee

MAURICE BOSSY  
ELIE W. MARTEL  
GILLES E. MORIN  
BERNARD NEWMAN  
NORMAN W. STERLING, Q.C.

RICHARD L. TRELEAVEN, Q.C.  
JOHN TURNER  
NOBLE VILLENEUVE  
DAVID W. WARNER

---

A. SMIRLE FORSYTH  
Clerk of the Committee

JOHN EICHMANIS  
Research Officer

MERIKE MADISSO  
Research Officer

Other members who served on the Committee during the hearings on this Order of Reference:- Robert V. Callahan, Q.C., Gordon Dean, Susan Fish, Mickey Hennessy, John Lane, David McFadden, Gordon Miller, Jean Poirier, and Alan Pope, Q.C.



## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
Chronology	2
Recommendations	9
Dissenting Opinion of Progressive Conservative Members of the Committee	12
Appendix I - Witnesses	13
Appendix II - Exhibits	14





## Introduction

On Thursday, 22 January 1987, the House adopted the following report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts:

Your Committee begs to report the incident of the attempted serving of the Member for Brantford (Mr Gillies), a Member of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, with a writ during the proceedings of the Committee this morning.

Your Committee recommends the referral of this matter to the Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly for investigation and report to the House as soon as possible.

In view of the fact that the Standing Committee on Public Accounts feels so strongly that it cannot be interfered with in the conduct of its business, Your Committee recommends strongly to the Committee to which the matter is referred that it consider the engagement of legal counsel to assist Mr Gillies in defending himself against legal action arising from this matter [see Appendix "I" for a list of witnesses and the dates on which they appeared before the Committee and Appendix "II" for a list of the Exhibits].

The Committee held meetings on the 17th, 18th and 19th of February, 1987, and heard evidence from Phil Gillies, M.P.P., Lyn Artmont, Executive Assistant to Phil Gillies, M.P.P., Sidney N. Lederman, Q.C., Counsel to Ivan Fleischmann and Canadian Intercorp Limited, Rex B. Clamp, a partner in Metro Process Servers Ltd., and David Patton, a process server with Metro Process Servers Ltd. The Committee also heard evidence from the Speaker and the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly.



## Chronology

The Committee has reviewed the transcript of the proceedings and the exhibits filed relating to the matter before it and has agreed to the following chronology of events:

October 27, 1986      Mr Gillies raised the Huang and Danczkay matter in the House.  
[Legislative Assembly of Ontario, Debates, October 27, 1986, p. 2808]

Mr Gillies issued a press release on Progressive Conservative caucus letterhead - "Developer with Liberal Ties Given Special Treatment by the Ministry of Housing."

October 28, 1986      Mr. Gillies raised the Huang and Danczkay matter in the House.  
[Legislative Assembly of Ontario, Debates, Oct. 28, 1986, pp. 2850-2851]

The Toronto Sun published a story - "Special Deal for Grits".

[The Toronto Sun, October 28, 1986]

Sometime during this period, Mr Ivan Fleischmann retained the law firm of Stikeman, Elliott and asked that it initiate a libel action against Mr Gillies, Ms Artmont, The Toronto Sun and two of its reporters. A notice of libel, pursuant to the Libel and Slander Act, was prepared. Under the Act, a libel action against a newspaper must be commenced within six weeks of the publication of the alleged libel. January 27, 1987, therefore, became the last day available for the issuance of a statement of claim. However, the service of the statement of claim could have been made up to six months after the action was commenced. According to Mr Lederman, Stikeman, Elliott was asked to serve the statement of claim quickly, as is the practice of the firm.

[Testimony of Mr S.N. Lederman, Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly, "Transcript", Feb. 18, 1987, pp. M-2, M-17-18]

October 29, 1986      Mr Gillies raised the Huang and Danckzay matter in the House.  
[Legislative Assembly of Ontario, Debates, Oct. 29, 1986, p. 2901]





October 30, 1986

Mr Gillies in the Standing Committee on Public Accounts gave notice that he would bring a motion before the Committee the following week, asking the Committee to undertake an inquiry into the loan by the Ministry of Housing to Huang and Danckzay.

[Standing Committee on Public Accounts, "Transcript", Oct. 30, 1986, p. 2967]

Mr Lederman stated that prior to November 5, 1986, the firm of Stikeman, Elliott examined the propriety of serving documents on a member of the Legislature at his office at Queen's Park. The firm considered section 38 of the Legislative Assembly Act and reviewed the leading Canadian authority on parliamentary privilege, Beauchesne's Rules and Forms of the House of Commons of Canada. The firm concluded that "service of a court document on a member of the provincial parliament at his office in Queen's Park was lawful and not in contravention of any legislative privilege enjoyed by the member."

[Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly, "Transcript", No. M-64, Feb. 18, 1987, pp. M-2-3]

November 5, 1986

Ms Lyn Artmont stated that on the morning of November 5, 1986, she received a telephone call from someone claiming to be a journalist, but who, she believed, was from a law firm. He asked who wrote the news release of October 27, 1986, whether the contents of the press release had been stated in the House and in committee by Mr Gillies, and why the press release was on Progressive Conservative caucus letterhead.

[Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly, "Transcript", Feb. 17, 1987, pp. M-1620-1, M-1625-1]

Both Mr Gillies and Ms Lyn Artmont stated that they heard that notice of the libel action against them had been posted in the press gallery.

[Ibid, pp. M-1405-1, M-1625-1]

Ms Artmont stated that she was called out of Question Period in the afternoon of November 5, and was told that the P.C. caucus has been served with a letter of intent from Mr Fleischmann. Subsequently she was handed a "letter" by a young man and was asked to take a "letter" for Mr Gillies.

[Ibid., p. M-1625-1]





Mr Gillies stated that after Question Period a lady approached him and handed him a "letter of intent" from Mr Fleischmann's solicitors. Mr Gillies understood the letter provided him with an opportunity to retract some points before legal action was commenced.  
[Ibid., M-1410-1]

Mr Lederman stated that an articling student from the firm of Stikeman, Elliott served the notices of libel on Ms Artmont at her office in Queen's Park. Ms Artmont accepted the Notice of Libel on behalf of Mr Gillies. Mr Lederman stated that the firm of Stikeman, Elliott did not post a notice with respect to the serving of documents in the Queen's Park press gallery, nor was the Notice served on Mr Gillies personally.

[Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly, "Transcript", No. M-64, Feb. 18, 1987, p. M-2]

November 6, 1986

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts adopted Mr Gillies' motion with respect to an inquiry into the Huang and Danczkay matter. The Committee placed the matter on its agenda.  
[Standing Committee on Public Accounts, "Transcript", Nov. 6, 1986]

January, 1987

Mr Gillies stated that after the Christmas holidays he said to Ms Artmont with respect to the Notice of Libel: "Gee, I wonder if we will ever hear anything more about that?" Mr Gillies assumed they would not.

[Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly, "Transcript", Feb. 17, 1987, pp. M-1410-2]

January 13, 1987

The Steering Committee of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts met in camera to schedule its meetings, including setting January 22, 1987, as the date when the Committee would deal with the Huang and Danczkay matter.

January 14, 1987

Statement of Claim was prepared by Stikeman, Elliott and issued in the Supreme Court of Ontario.

[Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly, "Transcript", No. M-64, Feb. 18, 1987, p. M-3]

January 15, 1987

Stikeman, Elliott contacted Metro Process Servers Ltd. and instructed the firm to serve Mr Gillies and Ms Artmont with a Statement of Claim at their offices at Queen's Park.  
[Ibid.]



January 16, 1987 Metro Process Servers Ltd. received statements of claim from Stikeman, Elliott.  
[Worksheet provided by Mr Clamp, Exhibit No. 2/1/17]

January 19, 1987 Ms Artmont stated that on this date she received a telephone call from someone who was calling on behalf of Stikeman, Elliott. The man did not identify himself by name.  
[Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly, "Transcript", Feb. 17, 1987, p. M-1625-1; Affidavit of Ms Lyn Artmont, Exhibit No. 2/1/07]

Mr Clamp stated that the date on which he called Ms Artmont was January 20, 1987, but could have been the 19th.  
[Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly, "Transcript", Feb. 18, 1987, p. M-1050-10]

Ms Artmont stated that the man said he had a "letter to deliver" to Mr Gillies and to her.  
[Affidavit of Ms Artmont, Exhibit No. 2/1/07]

Mr Clamp stated that he used the term "legal papers" or "legal documents".  
[Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly, "Transcript", Feb. 18, 1987, pp. M-1020-1; M-1035-1]

Ms Artmont proceeded to inform the caller of Mr Gillies' and her schedules for Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday of that week.

Mr Clamp stated that during this conversation with Ms Artmont he attempted to arrive at a mutually agreeable time when the Statement of Claim could be served.  
[Ibid., Feb. 18, 1987, p. M-1030-1]

Mr Clamp was particularly interested in their schedules for Wednesday and Thursday of that week. These were the days when Mr Patton worked for the firm and thus would be able to serve the documents.  
[Ibid., p. M-1055-2]

Mr Clamp arranged for Thursday morning, when Mr Gillies and Ms Artmont would be together in Room 151, where they could be served personally at the same time.  
[Ibid., p. M-1145-2]





Mr Clamp stated that 10.30 (a.m.) was the time that was set for the delivery or service of the documents, and asked whether the proceedings would be interrupted.  
[Ibid., p. M-1125-1]

According to Mr Clamp, Ms Artmont assured him that there would be no interruption.  
[Ibid., p. M-1045-1]

Ms Artmont stated that the caller (Mr Clamp) did not wish "to disturb Mr Gillies", but did not ask whether it would be appropriate to serve Mr Gillies during the meeting of the Public Accounts Committee. Nor, according to Ms Artmont, did she advise the man that Mr Gillies and she could be served during the meeting of the Committee, nor was she asked whether this could be done.  
[Affidavit of Ms Lyn Artmont, Exhibit No. 2/1/07]

Mr Clamp stated that Thursday was the best time for him to serve the documents; however, had he been told by Ms Artmont that Thursday was inconvenient, he would have made other arrangements.  
[Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly, "Transcript", Feb. 18, 1987, p. M-1120-1]

January 22, 1987

At about 9.00 a.m., Mr Gillies called Ms Artmont and asked her to take his file on Huang and Danczkay to the Public Accounts Committee in Room 151. During this conversation Ms Artmont said, according to Mr Gillies, that "she had forgotten to tell me earlier in the week that somebody had phoned saying they were representing Stikeman, Elliott and they wanted to give me a hand-delivered letter some time this week."  
[Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly, "Transcript", Feb. 17, 1987, p. M-1415-1]

Mr Gillies then asked her if she knew what it was about and she said she did not, "but we mused at the time as to whether, as we recalled, Stikeman, Elliott was Mr Fleischmann's law firm and as to whether it was apropos the same matter."  
[Ibid., p. M-1415-1]

Ms Artmont stated that she told Mr Gillies that he might be getting a letter from a law firm, but did not recall naming the law firm. According to Ms Artmont, Mr Gillies was upset and asked questions with respect to the matter. Ms Artmont then told Mr Gillies: "Do not worry about it, it is nothing. It is





probably not Fleischmann, and if it is Fleischmann, they would not show up today, and they certainly would not come into committee." [Ibid., p. M-1635-2]

Ms Artmont stated that she chose not to tell Mr Gillies about the telephone conversation with Mr Clamp earlier in the week because she did not think the matter was important. [Ibid., p. M-1635-2]

On Thursday morning January 22, 1987, Mr Patton was asked by Mr Clamp to serve the Statement of Claim on Mr Gillies and Ms Artmont.

[Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly, "Transcript", No. M-65, Feb. 19, 1987, p. M-1]

Mr Patton was given instructions to go to Room 151 and ask for Lyn Artmont, who would direct him to Mr Gillies.

[Ibid., p. M-3]

Both Mr Patton and Ms Artmont sat at the back of Room 151 directly across from each other. When they looked at each other, Mr Patton approached Ms Artmont and, according to Mr Patton, Ms Artmont said "I believe you are looking for me".

[Ibid., p. M-15]

At this point Mr Patton said he had a Statement of Claim to deliver to her and handed it to her.

[Ibid., p. M-5]

Mr Patton then asked Ms Artmont if Mr Gillies was in the room and she said yes and that she would get him.

[Ibid., p. M-9]

Ms Artmont then went to the coffee table and talked to Mr Gillies, who came over to Mr Patton. When Mr Patton gave Mr Gillies the Statement of Claim, Mr Gillies, according to Mr Patton, said: "I believe I cannot take the document". However, Mr Gillies did take the document.

[Ibid., pp. M-12, M-13]

Mr Gillies stated that on Thursday, January 22, 1987, he went to the Public Accounts Committee in Room 151. He was sitting at his

place and then got up and went to the coffee table, at which time Ms Artmont caught his eye and beckoned him to go to the back of the room. There he met Mr Patton who asked him if he were Mr Gillies. Mr Patton then said he



had "a document to serve to me and handed me this writ." After looking at it quickly Mr Gillies said that he was not sure whether he should accept the document since it appeared to be writ and Mr Gillies "was not sure whether, in fact, I should accept such a document because of a vague awareness that we all have of the provisions of the Legislative Assembly Act." No one appeared to know what to do next. Mr Gillies looked at Ms Artmont, who suggested, "Well, you have the papers in your hand now. Why not hang on to them until some sort of determination is made as to whether it was appropriate that they be served and whether, in fact, they were legally served or not." Mr Gillies kept the documents in his possession.

[Standing Committee on the Legislative Assembly, "Transcript", Feb. 17. 1987, p. M-1420-2]





## Recommendations

Based on the evidence before the Committee, your Committee concludes that the service of legal process on Mr Gillies in Room 151 of the Legislative Building while the Standing Committee on Public Accounts was meeting constitutes a contempt of the House.

A member is immune from service within the precincts of the House by virtue of a privilege enjoyed by the House in its corporate capacity on the ground that the service, or attempted service, of process in the precincts of the House is a violation of the dignity of, and an insult to, Parliament and an abuse of the privilege of admission to the precincts extended to persons by the House.

No member of Parliament, officer or employee of the Office of the Assembly, employee of any caucus or of any member, or other person, may authorize or invite a person onto the precincts to serve legal process.

This Committee concludes that Stikeman, Elliott did not use the service of the legal documents during the Public Accounts Committee proceedings to intimidate Mr Gillies and the other members of the Public Accounts Committee.

This Committee has concluded that a breach of a member's privilege has occurred. Stikeman, Elliott, in their capacity as the law firm issuing the legal documents, must assume some responsibility for the manner in which the documents were served. However, Mr Gillies, through his staff, must also share the responsibility for the fact that a legal document was served on him during a sitting of the Public Accounts Committee.

Your Committee recommends that:

1. The House take no action against any individual involved in this matter.

The Committee has considered the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts that it "consider the engagement of legal counsel to assist Mr Gillies in defending himself against legal action arising from this matter".

This is not a matter which Mr Gillies pursued with the Committee and the Committee therefore does not propose to make any recommendation to the House with respect to it.

The Committee is of the opinion that sufficient uncertainty exists with respect to the interpretation of section 38 of the Legislative Assembly Act that the section should be repealed and provision made to specifically prohibit the service of civil process upon any person in the Legislative Building, in any room in which a properly constituted committee of the House is meeting while the committee is meeting away from the seat of government, and in the legislative office of a member which is not located within the Legislative Building. In the latter case, such an office would not include the constituency office of a member but would include a member's office in the Whitney Block or in a similar office assigned to a minister



of the Crown or a parliamentary assistant. Such an office would be designated to be an office for the purposes of this section of the Act by the Speaker.

Your Committee recommends that:

2. Section 38 of the Legislative Assembly Act be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

38. No person shall make a personal service that is required or authorized by law in a civil matter upon another person,

- (a) in the Legislative Building;
- (b) in a room or place in Ontario in which a duly constituted committee of the Assembly is meeting; or
- (c) in an office of a member of the Assembly, other than a constituency office, that is situate outside the Legislative Building, and that is designated by the Speaker for the purposes of this section.

Paragraph 11 of subsection 45(1) of the Legislative Assembly Act be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

11. Making a service upon a person in contravention of section 38.

Section 39 of the Legislative Assembly Act be amended by striking out "the periods mentioned in section 38" and inserting in lieu thereof "a session of the Legislature or during the twenty days preceding or the twenty days following a session".

The Committee is of the opinion that it is important that every effort be made to ensure that members of Parliament and those involved with or interested in the work of Parliament are aware of matters which may be categorized as contempts of Parliament.

Subject to the Legislative Assembly Act being amended as proposed in recommendation 2 above, your Committee recommends that:

3. A statement with respect to service of process in the precincts of the House be circulated to all members of the Assembly and their staff, the staff of the Office of the Assembly, all deputy ministers, and process servers in the Province and that the statement also be circulated to all police forces by the Solicitor General and that The Law Society of Upper Canada inform the legal profession of the statement through the Society's "Communique" or such other means as the Society deems appropriate.





Your Committee further recommends that:

4. The statement proposed in recommendation 3 be in the following words:

#### NOTICE

#### OFFENCES AGAINST THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

It is a contempt of the House to serve, or to attempt to serve, a civil process in the Legislative Building, in a room or place in Ontario in which a duly constituted committee of the Assembly is meeting or in an office of a member of the Assembly, other than a constituency office, that is situate outside the Legislative Building, and that is designated by the Speaker for the purposes of this section.

Service of a civil process in contravention of the Act will constitute a contempt of the House regardless of whether the person served, or attempted to be served, is a member of Parliament or another person.

No member of Parliament, officer or employee of the Office of the Assembly, employee of any caucus or of any member, or other person, may authorize or invite a person into the Legislative Building or other proscribed area to serve a civil process.

Persons wishing to serve a civil process on a member of Parliament or any other person working in the Legislative Building or in those areas of other buildings designated by the Speaker should contact the person to be served and make arrangements to serve the person outside of the proscribed area. For example, a member could agree to be served in the park in front of or behind the Legislative Building or at his or her place of residence.



## Dissenting Opinion of Progressive Conservative Members of the Committee

The Progressive Conservative members of the Committee dissent to that part of the report that makes conclusions on the conduct of the law firm of Stikeman, Elliott, Mr Gillies and his staff. These conclusions were included as a result of a motion of Mr Bossy of the Liberal Party. We believe that this motion resulted out of frustration after the failure by the Liberal members of the Committee to go on "wild political fishing expeditions" (Mr Warner, NDP - Instant Hansard of Thursday Afternoon, Page M-3, March 19, 1987) to extend unnecessarily the hearings of the Committee.

It is unfortunate that the Committee did not heed the advice of Mr Callahan (Lib.) - Instant Hansard of Thursday Afternoon, Page M-8) - when he said "We are allowing, I am sure, our political affiliations and our political ideals to interfere with the judgement-making process." We believe that the Committee did just that in coming to the conclusions we object to.

The Conclusion of the Conservative Caucus is that the service of the statement of claim in the committee room was accidental, and therefore we are unwilling to blame any party for the breach. We do find it odd, however, that the members of the two other political parties placed an obligation on two defendants in a law suit to make certain that they were sued correctly. Surely this responsibility was on the shoulders of Mr Fleischmann through his agents, as he was the man who was suing these people for 2.7 million dollars.

In all other respects we agree with the report, but would urge anyone looking into this matter to refer to the Hansard reports in order to weigh all of the evidence for themselves.





A P P E N D I X   I



## W I T N E S S E S

- 17 February 1987      The Honourable Hugh Edighoffer, M.P.P.  
Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
- Claude L. DesRosiers  
Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
- Phil Gillies, M.P.P.  
Brantford
- Lyn Artmont  
Executive Assistant to Phil Gillies, M.P.P.
- 18 February 1987      Rex B. Clamp  
Partner  
Metro Process Servers Ltd.
- Sidney N. Lederman, Q.C.  
Counsel to Ivan Fleischmann and  
Canadian Intercorp Limited
- 19 February 1987      David Patton  
Process Server  
Metro Process Servers Ltd.





A P P E N D I X    I I



## EXHIBITS

- No. 2/01/001 SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO - Statement of Claim dated 14 January 1987 in an action in the Supreme Court of Ontario between Ivan Fleischmann and Canadian Intercorp Limited, Plaintiffs, and Phil Gillies, Lyn Artmont, The Toronto Sun Publishing Corporation, Ciaran Ganley and Pauline Comeau, Defendants.
- No. 2/01/002 LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO - Transcript of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts dated 22 January 1987, pages P-1045-1 to P-1135-2.
- No. 2/01/003 STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS - Report to the House on 22 January 1987 and adopted by the House on 22 January 1987.
- No. 2/01/004 LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO - Excerpt of the Debates of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, 22 January 1987, pages 4787, 4788, 4799 to 4811.
- No. 2/01/005 STIKEMAN, ELLIOTT - Letter dated 23 February 1987 to the Honourable Hugh Edighoffer, Speaker, Legislative Assembly of Ontario, from Sidney N. Lederman, with attached copy of letter dated 22 January 1987 to Phil Gillies from Sidney N. Lederman and copy of an affidavit dated 22 January 1987 sworn by Rex B. Clamp with respect to Fleischmann v. Gillies, Artmont et al.
- No. 2/01/006 LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO - Excerpt of the Transcript of the Debates of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario dated 26 January 1987, pages L-1330-1 to L-1340-1 and L-1400-1 to L-1405-1.
- No. 2/01/007 LYN ARTMONT - Letter dated 27 January 1987 to the Chairman of the Committee from Lyn Artmont, Executive Assistant to Phil Gillies, M.P.P., with an affidavit dated 27 January 1987, sworn by Lyn Artmont, attached.
- No. 2/01/008 NEWSPAPER ARTICLES - Clippings as follows:- 23 January 1987 [Toronto Star], 23 January 1987 [Toronto Sun], 23 January 1987 [Globe and Mail], and 26 January 1987 [Globe and Mail].
- No. 2/01/008-E NEWSPAPER ARTICLES - Clipping from 27 January 1987 [Globe and Mail].
- No. 2/01/008-F NEWSPAPER ARTICLES - Clipping as follows: - 23 January 1987 [London Free Press].



- No. 2/01/009 ORDER IN COUNCIL - Order in Council number 3195/78 dated 8 November 1978 designating certain parts of the Legislative Building to be under the control of the Speaker.
- No. 2/01/010 MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL - Memorandum dated 29 January 1987 from Richard F. Chaloner, Deputy Attorney General, to the Clerk of the Committee with respect to procedure in defamation actions.
- No. 2/01/011 SPEAKER OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY - Letter dated 3 February 1987 from the Honourable Hugh Edghoffer, M.P.P., Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, to the Chairman of the Committee with respect to the service of process in the Legislative Building.
- No. 2/01/012 DAVID PATTON - Affidavit dated 28 January 1987 sworn by David Patton together with a letter dated 13 February 1987 from Sidney N. Lederman to the Clerk of the Committee.
- No. 2/01/013 IVAN FLEISCHMANN - Notice of Libel dated 5 November 1986 given by Sidney N. Lederman, Q.C., Solicitor for Ivan Fleischmann, to Phil Gillies, M.P.P., Lyn Artmont, and all members of the Ontario Progressive Conservative Caucus.
- No. 2/01/014 PHIL GILLIES, M.P.P. - Daily Journal of Phil Gillies, M.P.P., 19 - 22 January 1987. [CONFIDENTIAL]
- No. 2/01/015 PHIL GILLIES, M.P.P. - Message File of Phil Gillies, M.P.P., for 19 - 20 January 1987. [CONFIDENTIAL]
- No. 2/01/016 STIKEMAN, ELLIOTT - Letter dated 15 January 1987 from David M. Brown to Metro Process Servers Ltd. with respect to the service of a Statement of Claim on Phil Gillies, M.P.P., Lyn Artmont and others.
- No. 2/01/017 DAVID PATTON - Worksheet dated 16 January 1987 outlining persons to be served with legal process by David Patton.
- No. 2/01/018 STIKEMAN, ELLIOTT - Letter dated 19 February 1987 from John Sopinka to the Chairman of the Committee with respect to instructions to the law firm from Ivan Fleischmann and attaching a letter dated 15 January 1987 from David M. Brown to Ivan Fleischmann and a memorandum of law dated 27 June 1978 from Burton H. Kellock to the Standing Committee on Procedural Affairs.
- No. 2/01/019 STIKEMAN, ELLIOTT - Letter dated 5 March 1987 from Sidney N. Lederman to the Chairman of the Committee with respect to a statement of defence received on behalf of Phil Gillies, M.P.P., and Lyn Artmont.





No. 2/01/020    STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY -  
Memorandum dated 16 February 1987 from the Clerk of  
the Committee with respect to privilege.







ISBN 0-7729-2455-4

